

agreement and that used Congressional Budget Office figures as the building blocks, as the revenue projections, the inflationary effect and so forth.

The President vetoed this bill. That is the President's prerogative, not only constitutionally, under the Constitution of the United States, of course, but under the agreement which also said there would be adequate funding for certain programs and if the President felt that the increases that that budget included for Medicare and Medicaid were not sufficient, then the President could go ahead and veto.

But the Congress has then made a very reasonable requests: "Mr. President, if you feel that our budget does not adequately protect certain priorities, show us your budget under the exact same framework. Put forward a budget under the exact same framework. Put forward a budget that is balanced in 7 years and uses the Congressional Budget Office economic projections and is shown to be balanced in 7 years under the CBO numbers, and show us how exactly you would protect your priorities."

□ 0915

If you want to spend more on one program, what do you propose to spend differently, or how do you propose to have a different tax structure in order to pay for it? The point is that if the President of the United States is going to veto the congressional budget, which again is his privilege, he should then put out his budget on the same framework.

Further negotiations I think are impossible unless we are dealing with budgets that are put together under the same measuring yardstick, apples to apples if you will. Unless the President puts forward a budget under the same yardstick, there is no way we can compare, well, this is how we funded a certain program and this is how the President would fund the same program.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to comply with our agreement and come forth with a budget.

PEOPLE ARE BEHIND THE BUDGET FIGURES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, there has been much name calling, there has been rhetoric, there has been invectiveness as we face the second Government shutdown of this year with really no end in sight, and as previous speakers have talked, the first one was the longest in the history of our Nation.

I think the President made a very valuable and very important point yesterday when he talked about the fact that there are people behind these figures. When you talk about cuts in Med-

icare and you talk about cuts in Medicaid, when you talk about adult children being held responsible for paying the nursing home bills for their parents, taking money out of the funds they would use to purchase a home, taking funds that they would use to send their children to college, we may be balancing the budget in the short run, but in the long run, our Nation will be much weaker. Those children of the adult children will be less educated.

I can remember back in the early 1980's when a Republican President named Ronald Reagan was pushing the same kind of idea, that somehow these massive tax cuts for wealthy individuals and wealthy corporations were going to trickle down and were going to help those of us that were on the lower side, those of us that were working individuals.

Let me tell you what happened in my area of southwestern Pennsylvania during that period of time. We lost in 13 counties 155,000 manufacturing jobs. No one ran away with those tax breaks. The rich corporations and the rich individuals did not reinvest that money in this country, and they are not going to do it now.

We are talking about taking money out of Medicare, taking money out of Medicaid, making adult children pay for the care that their working parents paid for with their tax dollars over the last 30 years, since 1965, when Medicare and Medicaid were passed in this House and were signed by President Johnson. They are taking that money and giving it away to the wealthy corporations of this Nation.

That is what it is about. It is about a transfer of wealth. It did not work in the 1980's, it blindsided our working people, and it is not going to work again in the 1990's, and President Clinton is very correct when he stands up and says that he will veto this.

Mr. Speaker, we have got to sit down and rebalance our priorities, not just balance our budget.

THE BUDGET IMPASSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, good morning to my colleagues and good morning to America. It is clear now that we have a congressional majority that lacks the maturity to govern this Nation's budgetary processes. We have arrived again at an impasse in which the Congress has failed to pass a budget and the spending bills necessary in an acceptable enough form in which the President of the United States would sign them, which is the responsibility of the Congress.

It is perhaps a good thing that the President is attempting to work with congressional leaders to help them figure through a shared approach to the

budget, but it is the Congress' responsibility to pass a budget as outlined in the U.S. Constitution. We have arrived at a point today at which the seemingly clear set of circumstances lead us to believe that the House Republicans, NEWT GINGRICH and his colleagues, are the single stumbling block to us arriving at a budget agreement.

We have the President, we have Senate Republicans and Senate Democrats who want to find a way to get the country back on the right track. House Democrats are prepared to work. But we have House Republicans who seem to in a childish way want to hold fast to their own particular viewpoint of how the budget ought to work out, a viewpoint that the American public has soundly rejected in every single poll that has been done over the last few months.

They keep pushing something that no one else is buying. The American public says "We don't want to cut education, we don't want to cut Medicaid, we do not want to see these programs eradicated. What we want to see is a more responsible approach that would lead us away from tax cuts, lead us away from increasing defense spending when it is not necessary, when it is well over what the Pentagon has even recommended." The American public has said no to the Republican budget, but yet NEWT GINGRICH and the House Republicans keep wanting to sell us something that no one is buying. That is why we have arrived again at this shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that as we face this new day here in the Congress, that some common sense would come to the majority, that they would stop acting in immature ways, because I think they really threaten their very majority in the ways they are acting now.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, the problem we are facing today is not a discussion between spending priorities. The problem we are facing today is that the President's budget leaves the Federal checkbook \$70 billion overdrawn. I have a chart with me that shows me where we were last week in terms of deficits. This bottom line is where the deficits were over the last week.

You will notice in the year 2002, all of last week we had a Presidential proposal that left us \$115 billion overdrawn. On Friday of last week, the President brought us a new proposal. Here is what it did. It took the \$115 billion deficit and it reduced it to a point where it was a \$70 billion deficit. The problem with this is that it is still \$70 billion out of whack in the 7th year.

Let me make this as clear as I can possibly make it. The proposal that we

have from the President today does not, I repeat, does not, balance the budget in 7 years. That makes it unacceptable.

Let me put this another way. In the 7th year of the President's proposal, he proposes that we spend \$106 billion more of the taxpayers' money and he proposes that we collect \$36 billion more from the taxpayers of this country. So he proposes that we spend \$106 billion more in the 7th year, and he proposes we collect \$36 billion more in taxes. That leaves us \$70 billion over in the 7th year.

Let me just finish, because this gets much better. The Republican plan that is currently on the table, the Republican plan on the table today, proposes that we spend \$11.948 trillion of the American people's money. That is to say, \$46,000 over the next 7 years for every man, woman and child in the United States of America, \$46,000 per person. The President wants to spend \$400 billion more than that.

I have a problem with that, because back in my district, they think \$46,000 a person is enough spending.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEUMANN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy. I would just note that the CBO numbers show that the Republican budget, the deficit goes back up in the years 2003, 2004, and 2005. Would the gentleman be willing, if I might finish, given his passion for balancing the budget, which I respect, to say if that happens, we should reduce some of the deep tax cuts in that budget so that we can balance the budget?

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, it is very important to look very seriously at the budget proposal we put out of our office earlier this year. We put forth a plan that balanced the budget, we had 5 years, but, OK, let us do it in 7 years as we have all agreed to in this House. After the 7th year, we would allow spending to increase at a rate 1 percent slower than the rate of new growth.

We need to go back to the plan as proposed in our budget proposal out of my office earlier this year, because what that will do is require that we start building a surplus so we can start paying down this debt, so we can give this Nation to our children without this huge debt. When you start talking beyond 7 years, the reality is we do not have much of an opportunity to work out those numbers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] has expired.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise Members that the time has been allocated.

MEANS OF CALCULATING BUDGET NUMBERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I guess the question I have this morning is when will our Republican friends propose a balanced budget? Yes, that is right, when will they propose a budget that is in true balance?

You see, they think that a balanced budget can be balanced using a calculator; that is the only tool that you need to see whether the numbers add up, whether you can add, subtract, divide, and multiply them. But a budget is more than a collection of numbers. It is a statement of a country's priorities, and not everything in that budget can be measured with mathematical accuracy.

How do you measure in mathematics what it costs to deny one young child the opportunity to participate in Head Start, to get all the education that he or she needs in order to be a productive member of this society and share in the American dream?

How do you measure with a calculator what it means to a family to be ripped asunder when suddenly they have the burden of having to care for a senior who has to be placed in a nursing home, and, under this Republican plan, you reach down and dip into the resources of the middle-class family that is already struggling to make ends meet to pay for that senior who has to be provided nursing home care?

How do you measure with mathematical accuracy the burden on the senior who has to choose between health care and being able to eat?

Those are the questions that have to be raised when you look at balancing the budget. Yes, it is an important objective to be sure the mathematics balance, but it is critical that any balanced budget have true balance. And that is what this is all about, because our Republican friends think as long as you take from those who are on Medicare and give to those corporations more tax breaks, do not ask the corporations to sacrifice, do not ask the wealthy to sacrifice, just ask the young children, just ask those who want clean air and clean water, just ask our seniors to sacrifice, put all the burden on one side, that is not a balanced budget.

I say it is time for our Republican friends to come forward with the first balanced budget, because all the ones they have given us up to now may add up in the numbers, but they do not add up when it comes to the future of America.

FACTS ON THE BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May

12, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I come here today to talk about the balanced budget and to talk about some things that may be educational to people who watch this.

First of all, I think the attacks on the majority fail to recognize the total picture. If you follow the rhetoric that you hear in attacking the Republican majority in their effort to balance the budget, if you follow their line of reasoning, we could never balance the budget so long as there was one individual out there who may not be served to the same extent that some think they should.

You ask the American people how they feel on these different issues, and we all know that it depends on how you ask the question. But the one thing that we are aware of and that has come through loud and clear is that when you ask the question "should we balance the budget," the American people say yes.

Yes, we will have to make choices. Yes, we will have to rearrange how we do business. Otherwise, some day the house of cards will come tumbling down.

It has been 30 years almost since the Federal budget was balanced, and the new Republican Congress has the opportunity to make this happen, with some support from the minority side. They say they want a balanced budget. Let us see some support from them to get that done. Or, if we fail, I think the American people will say "business as usual." We will not revisit any of the hard decisions between now and the next two decades if we fail this time.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is an article in the morning paper which I think was very interesting and might be very interesting to all of us and to the viewers at home. There are two categories of Government spending. One, where we purchase things for use by Government; and the other is transfer payments, and that is where we take from the middle-class family and transfer it, transfer it to somebody else, because they are not working or do not work or cannot work. And you have to address that problem, because it is now almost 20 percent of the Federal income that goes to transfer payments, and it is growing at an enormous rate.

So the discussion about the budget just is not crunching a few numbers and the President giving here and the Congress giving there. It is about how we do government and how we spend the money.

□ 0930

REPUBLICANS SHUT DOWN GOVERNMENT BECAUSE THEY CANNOT GET THEIR OWN WAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May